

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 93 02:00:31 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #91
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 10 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 91

Today's Topics:

 2 meter phone calls?
 CW,AM,no-code
 Let each determine their own incentive!
 motive ...
 No-code Issue (2 msgs)
 Remote control of ATV

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 13:23:34 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C56qwF.30C@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:

>Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:

>: In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:

>:

>: In general, the rules say the content of amateur transmissions shall
>: "be of such an unimportant nature that recourse to the public
>: telecommunications service is not justified" and "No station shall
>: transmit communications as an alternative to other authorized radio
>: services, except as necessary to provide emergency communications."
>: The latter, from Part 97.113, is pretty clear. If a cellular phone

>: could provide the communications, you can't use an amateur radio
>: phone patch.
>
>Ok, let's auger down on this part. Since the Cellular network now covers
>every major city, most minor ones, and all the roads in between, it would
>seem to be illegal to use an autopatch almost anywhere in the country, except
>in an emergency, of course.

With one caveat, if the communications is of such unimportant nature
that recourse to public telecommunications is not justified. Thus
showing off your new voice mail/phone patch to your next door neighbor
is unimportant enough that it's allowed. On the other hand, any call
important enough that you would have made it via cellphone, if you had
one, would be prohibited. If a reasonable person wouldn't drop a quarter
to make the call, then you can use the patch, otherwise you can't, except
for emergency traffic.

>That doesn't seem right either. I would focus on the words "as an alternative"
>as operative here. To me, they are trying to prevent amateur radio from
>competing with the phone company, which I expect everyone would agree with.
>Competition would imply a regular or high volume of usage, a gray area to be
>sure, but something which the amateur community should be able to self-police.
>There are lots of things a Cell phone "could" do, but that's not the point.

The real point is that cellphones were only a gleam in the eye when these
rules were written. 97.113 is a basis for prohibitions of many types of
activities. It's part of the reason broadcasting is prohibited. It's part
of the reason we can't order fuel for our boats via amateur radio. It's
part of the reason we can't direct tracking crews for our hot air balloons
or coordinate fleamarkets via amateur radio. It's part of the reason we
can't keep movie companies in communication, or dispatch service vehicles.
It's because there are alternative radio services designated to fulfill
those needs, and we can't infringe on those services' turf. We're here to
experiment, learn, and advance the radio art, not compete with public
utilities at *any* level.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 9 Apr 93 20:07:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: CW,AM,no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu says:

The purpose of my postings is to get people to think of the consequences of this or that. Not alot of people think long term. My main focus is preserving AM and CW. This is a hobby, we should be able to transmit what we want. Likewise, we should not have to transmit what we don't want. BUT, you fight to preserve your own view, not to destroy your opponents.

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu (one of the few OF's who can't
R.P.I. legally drink yet!.)
Troy, New York

I say:

If you read 97.1 again it says nothing about nostalgia (literally "looking backwards with pain" :-) as a raison d'etre for the Amateur Service. In fact there is a question in the Novice pool (the first thing you hit) which phrases it in almost the same way (see 2A-1.3)!

The Amateur radio service is recognised because:

- 97.1(a) it useful in emergencies
- 97.1(b) it has been shown to advance the radio art
- 97.1(c) it is useful for developing communication and technical skills
- 97.1(d) it increase the resevior of electronic technicians
- 97.1(e) it fosters international goodwill

Amateur radio history is important (I recommend Ade Weiss's book "History of QRP in the USA" for a non-ARRL-ocentric view of the early years of amateur radio) but it is not the reason for doing amateur radio.

Perhaps you need to found the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Radio Communications (SPARC) and you could get all of those T5 spark machines back on the air again.

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
a-kevinp@microsoft.com
"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 14:58:03 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!

theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Let each determine their own incentive!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> This is a complete crock. CW is *not* the most efficient mode of radio
> communication. It is not the fastest, the most reliable, the most
> anything. It is a fine mode of communication and deserves just as much
> respect and deference as any other mode of communication. No more and
> no less.

Bravo! Bravo! The same thought pattern, with SSB substituted for CW in
the above would work equally well...

> Besides, if CW is so great and the phone bands are so crowded, then there
> shouldn't need to be any more incentive than that for people to learn
> it.

And here, your argument falls down for failing to account for the fat
wallets and inflated egos of the SSB types on HF. Rather than accept
the incentive to switch to CW and carry on, the die-hard SSB guy
(usually, this generalization is made solely to make the point ;^)
buys a still larger and more powerful AMPLIFIER, erects a bigger
TOWER, with a larger stacked ARRAY, hooks up a SPEECH PROCESSOR (with
all knobs full-clock! ;^) and SCREAMS to be heard...

Meanwhile, 100Khz down the band, two hams enjoy a good conversation,
or even a game of chess, running 100W or less into a dipole.

The fast-food mentality, the I-Want-it-NOW way of thinking combine
with disposable income to create a rather unseemly solution, and the
obvious incentive is ignored.... because it requires work, patience,
commitment...money is faster and easier and far less invasive of the
mind-set...

THAT'S why people haven't followed the "incentive".

> Why should CW be
> singled out and forced upon every amateur that wants access to the low
> bands?

It is *NOT* "forced" on you, and since the HF spectrum is only 2% of
the total, why must everyone feel cheated because they do not want to
learn the Morse?

73,

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 14:37:44 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: motive ...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kme@node_17aa4.bnr.ca (Ken Michael Edwards) writes:
> There are those who still believe a homosexual lifestyle is wrong. You
> are advocating forcing a lifestyle on those individuals.
THAT tears it! I have heard that argument more times than I can count
and it is, simply, the most vacuous, ignorant, ill-informed,
perjorative, prejudicial and idiotic one of them all.

Just to set the record "straight" (with apologies to the gay and
lesbian hams who could probably state their case more eloquently ;^) I
am straight, the father of four (yeah, I know that means nothing, but
some narrow-minded people might actually equate the sperm delivery
process with "manliness", and so I toss it in... ;^) and have been a
ham for 37 years. I am 51 years old...an OLD FART!!! And, I have many
many friends, both social and Ham, who are gay/lesbian. They are HUMAN
BEINGS.

What these people want, Ken (and others) is NOT that you adopt their
"lifestyle", but that you simply accord to them the rights they have
as human beings, and not attempt to diminish them simply because in
your narrow mind and miniscule little heart you can not bring yourself
to be a decent human being and abide by the "live and let live"
principles.

You can look the other way when an advertisement for a missionary net,
or the Jewish hams appears, but leap up in self-righteous fervor and
jump to the conclusion that a simple announcement for a Ham radio
group, wishing to be able to more easily contact each other without
having to ask, on the air, and stir up all you maniacal homophobes,
whether the person they are addressing shares some significant life
pattern.

> please post only to the radio.amateur.policy, or I
> will not respond.

Do everyone a favor, and unless you have something CONSTRUCTIVE to
add, don't jump in simply to demonstrate your manifold intolerance and
bigotry...it doesn't become you...

> Ken M. Edwards, Bell Northern Research, Research Triangle Park, NC
> All opinions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of

> my employer or co-workers, family, friends, congress, or president.
Odd you feel the need to state the incredibly obvious when your
opinions barely have room in your heart and brain for anything else...

"Flame Shields at the Ready, Scotty!"
"Aye-Aye, Captain!"

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 01:27:30 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

k23690@lehtori.cc.tut.fi (Kein{nen Paul) writes:
> mellob@cary104.its.rpi.edu (Brett A. Mellor) writes:
> > So I feel fine about the code requirement. I would prefer that
> > the entry-level technician license be non-renewable. Leading
> > to the idea that you would have to upgrade eventually.
> Why should it be mandatory to get a HF-licence if you are only
> interested in VHF/UHF/SHF activities ? I personally prefer
> experimenting in the VHF/UHF bands and think that the HF-
> frequency range is most usable as the 1st or 2nd IF in a
> transverter :-)

A most interesting question indeed, Paul. I do not understand it
myself, and yet I read here/listen to on the air endless diatribes
from people who feel unjustly treated because they are not allowed to
use the ~2% of the ham allocations which require Morse Code
proficiency by virtue of International Treaty agreement.

[Flame Shields at the ready, Scotty!]
So, US non-HF licensed Hams, stop the whining, enjoy the marvels of
the hobby, and forget you are not legal on HF. If this really bothers
you, why not try learning the Code? I'll help teach you, and so far I
have done well with people who previously thought they were
CW-impaired... they were not. They merely suffered from really horrid
previous experiences and horrendous teaching methods.
[Flames Shields down, Scotty. Set Warp engines....]

+-----+
| Jack GF Hill Voice: (615) 459-2636 jackhill@jackatak.raider.net |
| P. O. Box 1685 Modem: (615) 377-5980 Compu\$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024 Bicycling and SCUBA Diving Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1993 07:58:46 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: No-code Issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1psb5gINNboi@chnews.intel.com> jbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:

>
>
>In my view, this is the Protestant work ethic warmed over twice. It
>is a statement of personal values that you assume everyone else shares.
>I don't share it. And the thing that makes it gross is that it is
>written into law. As a citizen, I feel the premises behind lawmaking
>should be under constant re-examination, particularly when they impinge
>on my freedom as this one (FCC regs.) does.
>
>- Jim Bromley, W5GYJ

Jim, do you consider operating a radio transmitter a right or a privilege?

Jeff, NH6IL

Date: Fri, 09 Apr 93 19:30:33 PDT
From: destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!oneb!ham!emd@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

> Why not put it on 421 or 426 which are actually in the band plan? Why do so m
> ATVers feel the need to transmit sync buzz in the satellite bands? 434.000 is
> recognized in the band plans and because the signal is 6 MHz wide, you are
> transmitting in weak signal areas. In many areas 433-435 is allocated for
> high-speed data links... I suppose the ATV crowd will recognize those as stri

> in the video...
>

That's not universally possible. If, in the USA, you're within 75 miles of the Canadian border, or if you're in Canada, you're not allowed to use 420-430 MHz for anything, including ATV.

While we've had operations in the Vancouver area for years on 434.6, the peak spectral energy doesn't fall in the 432 Mhz area, and the number of participants have been small enough to allow sharing the spectrum with the satellite/weak signal ops.

Nonetheless, the writing is on the wall, and work there has been concentrated on building 1.2 GHz FM ATV systems.

Robert Smits
VE7EMD
Ladysmith B.C.
e-mail: emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca

There is *no* idiotproof filter.
Idiots are proof against anything!
- Richard Chycoski, VE7CVS

Date: 9 Apr 93 16:41:54 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr7.140414.15415@ke4zv.uucp>,
<paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Apr9.125826.6978@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: No-code issue

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>That's right I *said* I was neglecting propagation. If propagation is
>considered, many more users can be accomodated due to frequency reuse.

Yes, but given your wording, you still omitted the fact that half the bands are closed at any given time.

>In the daytime 160 meters is a local band and the frequencies can be
>reused many times across a continent.

160 is not an HF band, by both definition and propagation. The fact that you get local reuse during the day is irrelevant, since it isn't performing a function that's significantly different from VHF/UHF in this capacity.

>80 meters is similar except that
>the coverage will remain statewide in the daytime.

Most of the time that 80 is open to propagation that is in excess of VHF, our interpid ops are asleep. Locally, 80 opens up about 1900, and closes at about 0800, depending on the season. Of those 13 hours, most of us sleep away eight.

> 40 meter coverage is
>greater, but still reusable on a hemispheric basis.

Yes, but we also share the band on a noninterference band with the broadcasters, whose signals pretty much destroy reuse, at least for SSB. I honestly wouldn't mind, though, if the FCC allowed SSB between 7050 and 7100, given that it's free (for the most part) from broadcasters. The same time analysis for 80 applies here, except that you can probably add an hour to both sides (total of 7 useful hours per day).

> 20 meters has skip
>zones that allow some reuse of frequencies. On 15 meters the skip zones
>are larger.

Yes, but both stations have to be in the skip zone of a third and forth, which is statistically unlikely. You might get a 25-50% reuse.

> With 10 meters, when the MUF drops the band is purely local
>and many stations can reuse the frequencies, when the skip is in the
>band is less useful, but there are still skip zones that allow reuse
>as on 20 and 15. Skip is a nuisance on HF, but the bands can still be
>useful for communications on many occasions.

Yes, but when the band is closed, it doesn't offer any significant advantage over VHF -- certainly not over 6m. Face it, the reason that people want access to HF is for long distance communication, and not just to have a little more local spectrum. The band doesn't perform that service when it's closed.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

Date: 9 Apr 93 16:32:41 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr8.155021.3317@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<paulf.734323544@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <1q3b74\$eop@cc.tut.fi>

Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

k23690@lehtori.cc.tut.fi (Kein{nen Paul) writes:

>This is true only if you are active for a predefined amount of time
>(eg. one hour each day) regardless you are using CW or SSB. On the
>other hand, if you are content with say 10 "standard" QSOs per day,
>the spectral efficiency question is much more complicated.

That may change the band loading, but not the spectral efficiency. Ham bands, like any other comm system, have peak hours and off peak hours. We're already at capacity on the weekends; witness the increasing hostility between the ragchewers and the testers.

>Keep in mind that every packed switched system (not just AX.25) operates
>in bursts and thus the wider channel is not allocated all the time.

Because of the extreme hidden transmitter problem, CSMA does not work at HF. In fact, it's arguable that CSMA really only works if you have lots of bandwidth to spare, eg, if your utilization is low.

>In on-line digital QSOs (CW, Pactor, Clover, AX.25) the throughput is
>limited by the ability of the operator to send (key or type) or receive
>(copy or read). Again, bandwidth is not equivalent to spectral efficiency.

The operator is occupying the bandwidth of the mode during a QSO. While some reuse is possible owing to propagation limitations, reuse is limited to about a factor of three, at most, at HF. Throughput is a binary concern when it comes to human conversation; either the throughput is adequate, or it isn't.

>A transmitted CW-signal might occupy less than 100 Hz, but this doesn't
>automaticly mean that you can put 10 CW signals in every kHz at least
>on regular basis.

Happens all the time on the bottom of 20 and 40. It doesn't require hyperadvanced filters, either.

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "We are meant to be masters of destiny, not victims
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | of fate." -- Ronald Reagan

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 16:51:50 GMT
From: amdcad!angelo!clark@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <186072@pyramid.pyramid.com>, <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>,

<1q2h8bINNdnf@west.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: Remote control of ATV

flloyd@l11-a.West.Sun.COM (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

>In article <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>
>frankb@sad.hp.com (Frank Ball) writes:
>>
>>This sounds legal. Hams put cameras in RC airplanes and that is legal.
>>The driver won't be in control of the camera, you are.
>>

>But BE CAREFUL! If the driver swoops down on some nude sunbathers,
>POOF! there goes your license!

>By the way, what frequency is it on? :-)

This is the other party involved (the one with the transmitter ;-))....
The freq will _probably_ be 434.000.

A side note: this is the same transmitter that was one side of the
first mobile-mobile ATV QSO in Arizona, waaaaay back in 1983 or so.

Brad // NP4AI

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 21:56:09 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!
dts@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>, <1q2h8bINNdnf@west.West.Sun.COM>,
<clark.734374310@angelo>
Subject : Re: Remote control of ATV

Why not put it on 421 or 426 which are actually in the band plan? Why do so many
ATVers feel the need to transmit sync buzz in the satellite bands? 434.000 is not
recognized in the band plans and because the signal is 6 MHz wide, you are
transmitting in weak signal areas. In many areas 433-435 is allocated for
high-speed data links... I suppose the ATV crowd will recognize those as stripes
in the video...

--

Daniel Senie
Banyan Systems, Inc.
508-898-1188
Internet: dts@banyan.com
Compuserve: 74176,1347
Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1993 07:47:16 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>, <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org>/
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

>
>What really ticks me off is listening to a bunch of OF's, OM's, and
>other comunistic Hams, talk _us_ down. Remember my friends, in 5
>short years _we will take over_.
>
>BTW, I'm also proud to say that I was a "CB'er" 6 years previous.
>

The best reason I've seen so far for keeping the code requirement
(i.e., "bleedover" from 11 meters)

Jeff, NH6IL

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 12:58:26 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.733965941@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Apr7.140414.15415@ke4zv.uucp>, <paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: No-code issue

In article <paulf.734203293@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
>
>>At 3 kHz spacing, and ignoring frequency reuse due to propagation, there's
>>room for 808 two way QSOs on the present HF phone segments.
>
>You're neglecting propagation in your analysis. E layer absorption and F
>layer refraction restrict the number of channels available at any one time.
>Moreover, the largest bands (10 and 75/80) are open for the least amount of
>time.

That's right I *said* I was neglecting propagation. If propagation is

considered, many more users can be accomodated due to frequency reuse. In the daytime 160 meters is a local band and the frequencies can be reused many times across a continent. 80 meters is similar except that the coverage will remain statewide in the daytime. 40 meter coverage is greater, but still reusable on a hemispheric basis. 20 meters has skip zones that allow some reuse of frequencies. On 15 meters the skip zones are larger. With 10 meters, when the MUF drops the band is purely local and many stations can reuse the frequencies, when the skip is in the band is less useful, but there are still skip zones that allow reuse as on 20 and 15. Skip is a nuisance on HF, but the bands can still be useful for communications on many occasions.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #91
